



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,597	10/711,597 09/28/2004		Susan Kirkwood	SK1001R	5596
7733	7590	03/07/2006		EXAMINER	
WALKER &			SANTOS, ROBERT G		
231 SOUTH MEDINA, C		WAY STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
11221111, 011 11200				3673	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		App	lication No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			711,597	KIRKWOOD, SU	KIRKWOOD, SUSAN			
			miner	Art Unit				
			ert G. Santos	3673				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi or Reply	cation appears	on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence a	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF T	AILING DATE (of 37 CFR 1.136(a). I unication. tutory period will appl will, by statute, cause	OF THIS COMMUN In no event, however, may a y and will expire SIX (6) MO the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on .						
·			n is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition t	for allowance e	xcept for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to th	e merits is			
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the a	pplication.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)□	Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> are subject to restriction	on and/or election	on requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers	•						
9)[The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any object	tion to the drawi	ng(s) be held in abeya	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	application from the Internation				ŭ			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	t(s)		_					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	TO 040:		Summary (PTO-413)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (P1	ГО-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:								

Application/Control Number: 10/711,597 Page 2

Art Unit: 3673

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-11, 20-22, 24 and 25, drawn to a mobility assistance device, classified in class 5, subclass 81.1R.
 - II. Claims 12, 16-19 and 23, drawn to a method of making a mobility assistance device, classified in class 428, subclass 99.
 - III. Claims 13-15, drawn to a method of using a mobility assistance device, classified in class 414, subclass 921.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as laminating a plurality of separate fabric pieces to form a multilayered device.
- 3. Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product

Art Unit: 3673

as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process such as wrapping the product around a patient's wrists to serve as a restraint device.

- 4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. A telephone call was made to Nancy L. Reeves on March 1, 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/711,597

Art Unit: 3673

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Page 4

examiner should be directed to Robert G. Santos whose telephone number is (571) 272-7048.

The examiner can normally be reached on Tues-Fr and first Mondays, 10:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Patricia L. Engle can be reached on (571) 272-6660. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

rest de Santos **Primary Examiner**

Art Unit 3673

R.S.

March 1, 2006